

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Examiner's ruling concerning the new restriction of claims has been duly noted. Claims 4-6 have, accordingly, been canceled. A divisional application to cover the newly canceled claims will be filed at the appropriate time.

The amendment to claim 1 that we discuss below makes claim 2 redundant. Said claim has, accordingly, also been canceled.

The present invention teaches a way to form a magnetically pinned layer by allowing it to overlap an antiferromagnetic layer only at its edges, leaving most of the pinned layer with no contact to an antiferromagnetic layer, thereby removing the possibility of any shunting effects by the latter.

Reconsideration is requested of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Morgan 6,737,283.

Examiner is thanked for demonstrating how claim 1 (as previously worded) could be argued to be a description of a structure that bears little resemblance to the present invention in terms of structure and no resemblance in terms of function.

Claim 1, as currently amended, now reads as follows:

1. A method to form a magnetically pinned layer, comprising:
 providing a layer of antiferromagnetic material having a central section that abuts a pair of opposing outer sections, said central section having a first top surface and said outer sections having second top surfaces; and

Appl. No. 10/816,040

Amdt. dated 01/08/2009

Reply to Office action of 12/12/2008

depositing a layer of magnetic material, part of which contacts only said second top surfaces, thereby forming said magnetically pinned layer, only a part of which is in contact with said layer of antiferromagnetic material.

In Morgan's FIG. 20 (cited by examiner) antiferromagnetic layer 75 is shown to be in contact with (pinned) ferromagnetic layer 77 over its entire length. Thus Morgan does not teach that only a part of layer 77 is "in contact with said layer of antiferromagnetic material".

Reconsideration is requested of the rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morgan in view of Heim et al. 5,465,185:

Claim 3 is dependent on claim 1. Applicant believes that the anticipated allowance of claim 1(in light of the above argument) will render claim 3 allowable.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Saile Ackerman LLC
28 Davis Avenue
Poughkeepsie
NY 12603

By



Stephen B. Ackerman
Reg. No. 37761